

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05834 251222Z

43

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-05

NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 NSC-05 EB-07 COME-00 OIC-02 /072 W

----- 014351

R 242030Z OCT 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 4260

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY PARIS

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 5834

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: MILI, MPOL, NATO, PFOR, NAC, FR

SUBJ: NATO STANDARIZATION - FRENCH AMBASSADORS REMARKS

AT OCT 22 NAC MEETING

REF: USNATO 5772 DTG 231511Z OCT 75

FRENCH DELEGATION TO NATO HAS PROVIDED US TEXT OF AMB DE
ROSE'S STATEMENT AT OCT 22 NAC MEETING ON STANDARDIZATION. THERE
FOLLOWS BELOW OUR INFORMAL TRANSLATION OF THIS STATEMENT:
BEGIN TEXT:

STANDARDIZATION AND PRODUCTION OF
ARMAMENTS

INTERVENTION BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF FRANCE

I WOULD LIKE TO GIVE YOU OUR INITIAL REACTIONS TO THIS
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 05834 251222Z

MATTER, TO WHICH WE HAVE NEVER FAILED TO ATTACH THE IMPORTANCE
THAT IT DESERVES. WE DO NOT UNDERESTIMATE THE RESULTS ALREADY
OBTAINED BY THE MILITARY AGENCY FOR STANDARDIZATION AND THE CNAD,
WHOSE PRINCIPLES ADOPTED IN 1966 HAVE NOT LOST THEIR VALUE.

HOWEVER, WE SHARE THE OPINION THAT THE RESULTS ARE INSUFFICIENT. ARMAMENTS ARE BECOMING MORE AND MORE COSTLY AND, AS THE INCREASE IN NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGETS IS NOT KEEPING PACE WITH THE INCREASE IN THE COST OF MATERIEL, IT IS THE STRENGTH OF ARMED FORCES WHICH WILL BE REDUCED.

WE ARE THEREFORE IN AGREEMENT ON THE GOALS TO BE ACHIEVED: INTER-OPERABILITY OF ARMAMENTS AND BETTER METHODS OF PRODUCTION WHICH WULD DECREASE COSTS. THE MOST DIFFICULT QUESTION IS HOW TO DO THIS AND, AS MY BELGIAN AND GERMAN COLLEAGUES HAVE SAID, WE WILL HAVE TO PROCEED WITH A REALISTIC STUDY OF THE QUESTION.

WE HAVE A US DOCUMENT IN FRONT OF US. WE ARE IN AGREEMENT WITH A LARGE NUMBER OF POINTS THAT IT CONTAINS: MILITARY AND ECONOMIC OBJECTIVES; THE NECESSITY TO SEE AHEAD, THAT IS TO PLAN A LONG-TERM POLICY; RAFFIRMATION OF NATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES; AND PROPOSALS TO ESTABLISH A "TWO-WAY STREET" PERMITTING A EUROPE-AMERICA DIALOGUE.

AS WE SEE IT, THE FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM HAS TWO ASPECTS:

- THE FIRST RESPONDS TO BASICALLY MILITARY CONSIDERATION.

THIS IS THE QUESTION OF INTEROPRABILITY OF EQUIPMENT. THIS IS PRECISELY WHAT IS COVERED BY THE WORD STANDARDIZATION. WE CAN CERTAINLY DO BETTER, WE CERTAINLY CAN DO MORE AND FASTER THAN WHAT HAS BEEN DONE IN THE PAST.

PERHAPS WE COULD SEARCH FOR THE MOST URGENT ITEMS ON WHICH THE WORK OF STANDARDIZATION STAGNATES, FOR EXAMPLE, IN THE AREAS OF ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT, LOGISTICS OR AMMUNITION. WHAT ARE THE MOST CRITICAL NEEDS FOR IMPROVING THE SITUATION? WE COULD TAKS THE SPECIALISTS WITH FINDING THE MOST URGENT ITEMS ANDFORMULATE A HIGH PRIORITY PLAN TO WHICH GOVERNMENTS COULD GIVE A PLLITICAL IMPULSE. WE COULD, FOR EXAMPLE, ESTABLISH MEDIUM TERM. DEAD-LINES AND THE GOLAS TO BE REACHED DURING THENEXT FOUR OR FIVE YEARS.

- THE SECOND ASPECT OF THE PROBLEM IS THAT OF PRODUCTION.

THIS IS A FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE FROM MANY POINTS OF VIEW AND, IN PARTICULAR AS THE DEAN (AMB DE STAERCKE) HS STRESSED, DEALS WITH RELATIONS BETWEEN EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES. HE HAS SAID THAT IT IS NECESSARY TO ESTABLISH PRINCIPLES OF COMPEITION; I WAS GOING TO CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 05834 251222Z

SAY RULES OF THE GAME. THE IDEA IS THE SAME. IT RESULTS FROM THE DIFFICULTY OF THE PROBLEM. EUROPEAN INDUSTRIES ARE NOT OFTEN OF THE SAME SCALE AS INDUSTRIES IN THE UNITED STATES AND EUROPEAN INDUSTRIES ARE NOT EQUAL IN SIZE AMONG THEMSELVES. IN PLACES WHERE THESE INDUSTRIES ARE NOT EQUAL IN SIZE AMONG THEMSELVES. IN PLACES WHERE THESE INDUSTRIES ARE HIGHLY DEVELOPEED, THEY PLAY AN ESSENTIAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL ROLE IN THE STRUCTURE OF THESE COUNTRIES. IN FRANCE, THEY PLAY AN IMPORTANT ROLE IN EXPERTS AND THUS IN THE ALANCE OF PAYMENTS. THERE ARE SOME COUNTRIES WHICH ARE PRODUCERS AND PURCHASERS AND SOME COUNTRIES ESSENTIALLY PRUCHASERS. THERE IS THEREFORE A LARGE DISPRITY AMONG EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

THERE IS A POINT ABOUT WHICH WE ARE PARTICULARLY CONCERNED.

THAT IS OF THE FUTURE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN EUROPE. M. DE STAERCKE HAS SAID THAT COMPETITION MUST NOT RESULT IN THE CRUSHING OF EUROPEAN INDUSTRIES. THIS ISSUE IS INSEPARABLE FROM THAT OF THE VIGOR OF RESEARCH.

IT IS UNDOUBTEDLY NECESSARY AND OF COMMON INTEREST TO ASSURE A PERMANENT CONTRIBUTION BY EUROPEAN GREY-MATTER TO RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION OF ARMAMENTS. OUR INDUSTRIES ALL HAVE RESEARCH CENTERS THAT CONSTITUTE AN ASSET WHICH IS NOT ONLY EUROPEAN, BUT BELONGS TO THE ENTIRE ALLIANCE. MILITARY BALANCE WITH THE WARSAW PACT WHICH OFTEN HAS A NUMERICAL SUPERIORITY, REQUIRES THAT WE HAVE HIGHLY DEVELOPED TECHNOLOGY. WE MUST USE ALL OF OUR ADVANTAGES. THUS THE COOPERATION WHICH WE MUST ESTABLISH REQUIRES AS A BASIC NEED THE CONTINUING PARTICIPATION OF EUROPE IN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AND THE CONDITIONS NECESSARY TO MAKE IT POSSIBLE.

THIS LEADS US TO BELIEVE THAT THE PRINCIPLE OF COST-EFFECTIVENESS, TO WHICH THE US DOCUMENT JUSTLY GIVES GREAT IMPORTANCE, MUST BE TEMPERED BY THE OTHER PRINCIPLE THAT IT IS IN THE INTEREST OF ALL THAT EUROPEAN CONTRIBUTIONS IN RESEARCH MUST BE PRESERVED AND UTILIZED IN THE SAME MANNER AS INDUSTRIAL CAPABILITIES. THIS IS A NECESSARY CONDITION TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DIALOGUE WHICH IS DESIRED BY ALL.

THIS IS WHAT I WANTED TO SAY, MR. CHAIRMAN. A DISCUSSION ON THIS POINT IS NECESSARY, AS WELL AS ON THE OTHER GENERAL IDEAS WHICH MY COLLEAGUES WOULD BRING TO OUR DISCUSSION. AND, IN OUR VIEW, THIS DISCUSSION BELONGS IN THE COUNCIL.

AS TO THE OTHER PROPOSALS WHICH ARE CONTAINED IN PO/75/117, I DO NOT YET HAVE THE REACTION OF MY AUTHORITIES WHO PRESENTLY CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 05834 251222Z

HAVE IT UNDER STUDY. I WOULD ONLY ADD, ON A PERSONAL BASIS, THAT THE IDEA OF AN AD HOC COMMITTEE CHARGED WITH A TASK OF LIMITED TIME SEEMS PREFERABLE TO THAT OF A PERMANENT BODY. BUT BEFORE IT MEETS, IT WILL BE NECESSARY TO DISCUSS ITS COMPETENCE AND MANDATE.

MY DELEGATION WILL THEREFORE HAVE TO RETURN TO THIS QUESTION AT A LATER MEETING. END TEXT. BRUCE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 24 OCT 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO05834
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197510101/abbrzmui.tel
Line Count: 149
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: USNATO 5772 DTG 231511Z OCT 75
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 30 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <30 APR 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <01 MAY 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: NATO STANDARIZATION - FRENCH AMBASSADORS REMARKS AT OCT 22 NAC MEETING
TAGS: MILI, MPOL, NATO, PFOR, NAC, FR
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO BONN
LONDON
PARIS
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006